DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 832 RC 013 334

AUTHOR Morales, Maria E.
TITLE Migrant Education Training Program.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Competence; Discipline; *Educational Needs; Instruction; Interpersonal Competence; *Migrant Education; *Needs Assessment; Program Descriptions; Questionnaires; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Skill Development; Teacher Education; Teacher Improvement; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

In the summer of 1981, 92 participants of 2 Migrant Personnel Training Projects, 20 participants of a local school district Migrant Education Summer Program, 14 participants of a university class studying school supervision and administration, and 209 participants of 7 summer Migrant Personnel Training Institutes were surveyed, using the Migrant Education Special Project Survey Form, to determine the training needs of Texas migrant education personnel. The Survey Form consisted of 21 items which gave the participants' an opportunity to express their feelings of competence or lack of competence in 6 major areas of study: instruction; interpersonal skills; learning (principles and styles); classroom management; evaluation (tests and measurement); and any additional topics named by the participants. Findings indicated that 110 respondents felt they needed skills for teaching reading, 108 needed skills for teaching language, and 126 needed skills for teaching math; 191 respondents felt competent in their ability to motivate students; 97 respondents felt they needed further development in interpersonal skills; 71 respondents felt they needed further skills in keeping discipline; 196 respondents felt competent in interpreting tests; 189 respondents felt competent in using test results; and 249 respondents felt competent in grading tests. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215832

MIGRANT EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAM

Dr. Maria E. Morales

Texas A&I University

MAY 1982
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Paper Presented at the Meeting
of the Southwest Educational Research Association
Austin, 1982

Mail Inquires to:

Dr. Maria E. Morales
Education Department
Box 196
Texas A&I University
Kingsville, Texas 78363

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maria E. Morales

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC 013334

INTRODUCTION

> The School, as an institution, has great responsibility for certain determinants that are absolutely necessary for fulfilling its mission to the migrant child[1]
>
> -Alfred M. Potts

Students that participate in migrant education programs encounter intermittent school experiences that unfortunately leave some children no choice but to follow their parents into the fields. These children seldom are accepted in their working communities; also, the highly mobile students face the barrier of incompatible state requirements for a diploma. According to the National Education Association, today, although 700,000 mobile children receive educational services in schools, most eventually decide to follow their parents into the fields. Only one of ten migrant education students, graduates from school.[2]

General Purposes of the Program

The general purposes of the migrant program are contained in the Declaration of Policy found in Section 101 of Title I of Public Law 95-561, the 1978, amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.[3]

Texas Migrant Education Program

In an attempt to find ways of providing leadership in bringing the school and the migrant into a cooperative effort for education, the Texas State Board of Education in 1962 requested that a survey be made to determine the number of migratory children in Texas and their patterns of migration. Although complete returns were not received from all school districts surveyed, those districts returning the questionnaires reported 48,775 migrant children enrolled in Texas public schools. On January 7, 1963, as a result of the survey, the State Board of Education approved the appointment of a commission to consider more effective ways of educating migrant children. The commission, working with the staff of the Texas Education Agency, proposed a Six Month School Program. The resulting program with a longer daily schedule and fewer holidays provided for instructional hours equivalent to the instructional hours required in the Nine Month Program.

The State Board of Education adopted the report of the commission, and in September 1963 five school districts, in the Lower Rio Grande Valley began the Texas Project for the Education of Migrant Children with a combined enrollment of 3,000 students. A committee composed of selected public school personnel and representatives of the Texas

Education Agency designed a formula for allocating teachers on the basis of peak enrollment figures, rather than on the customary basis of average daily attendance.

The evaluation at the end of the first year revealed that the students participating in the program had made gains in academic growth and social adjustment comparable to those made in the Nine Month Program by full-time students with similar backgrounds. Also, it revealed a positive acceptance of the Program by teachers, parents, and community leaders.

At the end of the second year it was evident that if the effectiveness of the program was to be truly tested, additional funds were needed. Consequently, in 1965, the Texas Education Agency, through the Governor's Office, made application to the United States Office of Economic Opportunity and received a grant of $3,312,936. Those funds provided for the operation of special programs in 20 additional schools. The schools in the program provided additional professional personnel, teacher aides, lunches and snacks, clothing, medical examinations, and medical followup for children needing those services.

The number of migrant children in any one school may vary significantly from year to year, but the number of programs and the number of migrant children participating has increased steadily.

On January 1, 1967, funds for the education of migrant children became available under the Title I Migrant Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of 1965, Public Law 89-10, and replaced funds previously granted through the Office of Economic Opportunity. With funds provided by the Act, participating schools have purchased instructional materials and equipment, employed additional teachers, teacher aides, and special service personnel, expanded inservice programs, and have offered more comprehensive health, food, and clothing service.

During the spring of 1968 approximately 178 classrooms were constructed to serve approximately 3,500 five- and six-year-old migrant children. In 1969, 29 additional classrooms were funded to serve approximately 4,000 kindergarteners.

Since 1972 the Migrant Kindergarten children have been incorporated into the Foundation School Program and are counted for allocation monies on the same basis as the regular migrant program.

By the 1969-70 school year 71 projects were participating in programs which provided supplementary instructional and ancillary services for approximately 39,000 migrant children in Texas. During that year the participating schools enlarged their preschool summer programs,

as well as their education and vocational programs for junior and senior high schools to meet the needs of more children. In addition, summer programs were initiated to include migrant students who had moved within the last five years.

The school project for 1970-71 operated in approximately 53,300 migrant children in Grades K through 12. The project was designed to provide educational and ancillary services for migrant children enrolled in project schools. The educational phase of the project included instruction in language arts, social studies, science, mathematics, art, music, health and physical education, and arts and crafts.

For 1972, Texas operated 10 pilot classrooms for four-year-old migrant prekindergarten students. Five of these classroom units were in the McAllen Independent School District and five of these units were in the Hereford Independent School District. As pilot projects, the main purpose of these units was the development of curriuclum materials for four-year-old migrant students.

In 1973, 88 preschool units for four-year-olds were established statewide thus bringing to fruition the pilot program which had been initiated in 1972. Attention was then directed towards strengthening the instructional

program in the primary grades. The result of much study was the initiation of another pilot program effort to be called Performance Objectives Pilot Project, later named Accutruk.

In the fall of 1974, 189 school district received direct and indirect assistance funding under the Elementary and Secondary Act Title I Migrant Amendment to operate supplementary instructional and ancillary programs for migrant children. Sixteen of those school districts operated the Foundation Program Seven Month School.

The migrant program continued to grow in Texas and in the nation. With full implementation of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System and the use of computerized data as a basis of funding the number of identified eligible migrant students increased markedly from the previous years' data estimates. Not only did the program increase in numbers of students but the geographic scope expanded considerably from 1976 through 1980. At present migrant education activity is ranging from recruitment only components to a full range of migrant education services in 19 of the 20 education service center areas.

In 1979 the Interstate Cooperation Project was expanded to include a variety of activities such as Secondary Credit Exchange, Exchange Vists between schools, Content Specialists for Inservice and the original project

component became known as the Summer Project Assignment.

Improved delivery of supplementary instructional services for secondary migrant students with educational needs became of the highest priority in the 1980-81 school year. With special emphasis on the older migrant student secondary services increased from 65% of the identified population in 1979-80 to 80% in 1980-81.

The following chart outlines the growth of the migrant education program in Texas.

GROWTH OF MIGRANT PROGRAM

Fiscal Year	Number of School Districts	Number of Migrant Children
1964	5	2,645
1965	10	6,500
1966	40	16,199
1967	40	16,769
1968	65	31,779
1969	66	39,181
1970	71	44,957
1971	78	53,331
1972	95	59,770
1973	107	66,915
1974	121	69,119
1975	189	50,138
1976	204	87,307
1977	270	101,063
1978	284	108,114
1979	302	111,640
1980	333	116,505

1969-1973 - Estimated number of children enrolled

1974-1975 - Total Full-time Equivalent migrant students

1976-1980 - Full-time Equivalent ages 5-17 migrant students

PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY

> The teacher and auxiliary personnel are the agents of the school who must do the analyses and execute programs. To be effective they must possess adequate understanding and have clearcut directives for the school's objectives and purposes.[1]
>
> -Alfred Potts

Subjects

The population with which the study was concerned was Migrant Education Program personnel. Information was gathered from personnel who participated in 11 Migrant Educational Programs that took place in the Summer of 1981. The data for this study were gathered from programs conducted as follows: two Migrant Personnel Training Projects and 92 participants; one local school district Migrant Education Summer Program and 20 participants; one University class studying supervision and administration of schools, and 15 participants; and seven Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institutes and 209 participants.

Collection of Data

The data derived from the Migrant Education Special Project Survey Form (Appendix A) were used to determine the training needs of the Migrant Education personnel. This instrument was developed by the Migrant Education Planning Team in the Spring of 1981 (Appendix B).

Descriptive information on the training needs of Migrant Education personnel was gathered from two additional sources:

1) knowledge and opinions shared by participants at a Migrant Education Parent Involvement Conference (Appendix C); and,
2) knowledge and opinions shared at interviews and meetings with prominent educators knowledgeable in the development of instructional programs for migrant children (Appendix D).

The information, gathered at these meetings, was taken into consideration by the Migrant Education Planning Team when it formulated the Migrant Education Special Project Survey Form.

The Migrant Education Special Project

Survey Form

The following instructions were given to the participants when the Migrant Education Special Project Survey Form was administered:

> In an effort to improve migrant education in the state of Texas, we would like to find out what additional skills are necessary for personnel who work with children of migrant families.
>
> We would therefore, appreciate Your assistance in obtaining this information. If additional space is needed please use the reverse side.

The Migrant Special Project Survey Form consisted of 21 items which gave the participants' an opportunity to express their feeling of competence, or feeling of lack of competences, in six major areas of study:

The general areas designated in the study were:

1) Subject Areas - Instruction

   The sub topics studies under this major area were: reading, language, math and other;

2) Interpersonal Skills

   The sub topics studies under this major area

included: development, guidance, counseling, motivation, and other;

3) Learning

The sub topics studies under this major area include: principles, styles, and other;

4) Classroom Management

The sub topics studies under this major area included: discipline, organization, and other;

5) Evaluation (Tests and Measurement)

The sub topics studies under this major area included: selection, administration, interpretation, use of results, grading, and other;

6) Additional Areas

The sub topics studies under this major area included any topics named by the participants. Space was provided for the topics to be written in and discussed if desired.

To supplement the above information, an additional page was supplied with the following instructions:

Please make any comments you may have concerning other areas of knowledge you think need to be studied. Please be specific.

The data gathered from the Migrant Education Special Project Survey Form will be described in tables.

TABLE I

MIGRANT PROGRAM INFORMATION: LOCATION, ORGANIZATION, AND NUMBER OF SUBJECTS OF EACH PROGRAM

Date	Program	Location	Organization	Number of Subjects
1981				
June 30	1	Kingsville	Migrant Personnel Training Project	76
July 7	2	Robstown	Local School District Summer Program	20
July 16	3	Kingsville	Migrant Personnel Training Project	16
July 24	4	Kingsville	Administration - Supervision Class	15
July 28	5	Beeville	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	22
July 29	6	Corpus Christi	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	38
July 28	7	Falfurrias	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	35
July 28	8	Mathis	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	11
July 28	9	Robstown	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	31
July 28	10	San Diego	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	49
July 28	11	Sinton	Summer Migrant Personnel Training Institute	23

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION: YEARS OF SERVICE OF MIGRANT PERSONNEL BY PROGRAM

Program	Number Years of Experience								
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	Over 30	No/A	Total
1	49	17	5	0	2	1	0	2	76
2	11	2	3	2	1	0	0	1	20
3	8	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	16
4	3	8	1	2	1	0	0	0	15
5	12	7	1	1	0	0	0	1	22
6	19	8	2	0	5	1	0	3	38
7	7	11	5	5	2	1	3	1	35
8	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	11
9	16	6	1	2	1	3	1	1	31
10	14	18	6	4	1	1	4	1	49
11	8	9	1	1	4	0	0	0	23
Total	150	96	28	18	17	7	8	12	336
Percentage	44.64	28.57	8.33	5.36	5.06	2.08	2.38	3.57	

TABLE 3

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION: INSTRUCTIONAL ASSIGNMENT OF MIGRANT PERSONNEL BY PROGRAM

	Instructional Assignment							
Program	Early Childhood	Elementary	Secondary	Administrator	Supervisor	Other	N/A	Total
1	7	48	10	0	0	4	7	76
2	2	10	3	0	0	1	4	20
3	4	4	2	0	0	1	5	16
4	1	8	3	0	0	1	2	15
5	3	12	2	0	0	1	4	22
6	2	26	0	0	0	1	9	38
7	0	20	4	0	0	2	9	35
8	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	11
9	2	18	2	0	0	0	9	31
10	3	27	6	0	0	3	10	49
11	0	21	0	0	0	0	2	23
Totals	24	201	32	0	0	14	65	336
Percentage	7.14	59.82	9.52	0	0	4.17	19.35	100

The data collected for Table 4 indicated that 212 subjects felt competent in teaching reading, 212 subjects felt competent in teaching language, and 193 subjects felt competent in teaching math. It also indicated that 110 subjects felt they needed to develop skills for teaching reading, 108 subjects felt they needed to develop skills for teaching language, and 126 subjects felt they needed to develop skills for teaching math. No response was made by 14 subjects in reading, 16 subjects in language, and 17 subjects in math.

Concerning interpersonal skills, the data gathered for Table 5 indicated that 205 subjects felt competent in the development of the skills, 186 subjects felt competent in the guidance of students, 62 subjects felt competent in the counseling of students, and 191 subjects felt competent in their ability to motivate students. The information also indicated that 97 subjects felt they needed to develop further in interpersonal skills, 126 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in guidance, 55 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in counseling, and 125 subjects felt they needed further skills in motivation. There were 34 no answer responses in development, 24 in guidance, 10 in counseling, and 20 in motivation.

TABLE 5

NEEDS ASSESSMENT: INTERPERSONAL SKILLS:

DEVELOPMENT, GUIDANCE, COUNSELING,

AND MOTIVATION

	Interpersonal Skills			
Response	Development	Guidance	Counseling	Motivation
	Number of Subjects			
Felt Competent	205	186	62	191
Need to Develop Skills	97	126	55	125
No/Answer Response	34	24	10	20
Total 336				
	Percentage			
Felt Competent	61.01	55.36	48.82	56.85
Needs to Develop Skills	28.87	37.50	43.31	37.20
No/Answer Response	10.11	7.14	7.87	5.95

TABLE 6

NEEDS ASSESSMENT INFORMATION: AREA OF LEARNING THEORY: PRINCIPLES AND STYLES

	Learning	
Response	Principles	Styles
	Number of Subjects	
Felt Competent	220	192
Need to Develop Skills	101	130
No/Answer Responses	15	14
Total 336		
	Percentage	
Felt Competent	65.48	57.14
Need to Develop Skills	30.06	38.69
No/Answer Responses	4.46	4.17

TABLE 7

NEEDS ASSESSMENT INFORMATION:

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT DISCIPLINE,

AND ORGANIZATION

Response	Classroom Management	
	Discipline	Organization
	Number of Subjects	
Felt Competent	253	232
Need to Develop Skills	71	92
No/Answer Reponses	12	12
Total 336		
	Percentage	
Felt Competent	75.30	69.05
Need to Develop Skills	21.13	27.38
No/Answer Responses	3.57	3.57

TABLE 8

NEEDS ASSESSMENT: EVALUATION: TESTS AND MEASUREMENT:

SELECTION, ADMINISTRATION, INTERPRETATION,

USE OF RESULTS, AND GRADING

	Evaluation: Tests and Measurement				
Response	Selection	Administration	Interpretation	Use of Results	Grading
Felt Competent	195	226	196	189	249
Need to Develop Skills	119	84	123	123	54
No/Answer Responses	22	26	17	24	33
Total 336					
	Percentage				
Felt Competent	58.04	67.26	58.33	56.25	74.11
Need to Develop Skills	35.42	25.00	36.61	36.61	16.07
No/Answer Responses	6.54	7.74	5.06	7.14	9.82

The data collected for Table 6, demonstrated that 220 subjects felt competent in their application of knowledge of the principles of learning, and 192 subjects felt competent in their application of knowledge of learning styles. The data also indicated that 101 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in the application of the principles of learning, and 130 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in their application of their knowledge of learning styles. No response was made by 15 subjects concerning principles, and 14 subjects concerning styles.

Concerning classroom management, the data accumulated for Table 7, notes that 253 subjects felt competent in their ability to keep discipline, and 232 subjects felt competent in the ability to organize a classroom. The data also indicated that 71 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in keeping discipline, and 92 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in the organization of a classroom. There were 12 no answer responses for discipline, and 12 no answer responses for organization.

The information gathered for Table 8 indicated that 195 subjects felt competent in being able to select tests, 226 subjects felt competent in being able to administer tests, 196 subjects felt competent in being able to interpret tests, 189 subjects felt competent in being able

to use test results, and 249 subjects felt competent in grading tests. The information further indicated that 119 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in the selection of tests, 84 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in the administration of tests, 123 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in the use of test results, and 54 subjects felt they needed to develop further skills in grading. There were 22 no answer responses for selection, 26 no answer responses for administration, 17 no answer responses for interpretation, 24 no answer responses for use of results, and 33 no answer responses for grading.

Tables number 9 to 13 describe the data gathered from the responses made, to the questions in the Migrant Education Special Project Survey Form questionnaire, by the participants in Migrant Education Program 1. The data depicted in Table 9 to Table 10 represent the total responses made to the questions that provided information on the participants' years of experience; as well as, their instructional assignments. The data also indicated 42 subjects felt competent in their ability to teach reading, 47 subjects felt competent in their ability to teach language, 41 subjects felt competent in their ability to teach math, 52 subjects felt competent in their ability to develop interpersonal skills, 36 subjects felt competent

7.74 percent of the responses in the area of administration; 5.06 percent of the responses in the area of interpretation; 7.14 percent of the area of use of results; and, 9.82 percent of the area of grading.

Summary and Recommendation

In summary, in ranking the responses made by the participants in the Migrant Education Project Survey Form questionnaire, the total number of responses given was taken into consideration. The following ranking would be assigned to the different items included:

Subject Areas - Instruction

In responding to the statement: I feel competent in these areas:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Reading	2
b	Language	1
c	Math	3

In responding to the statement: I feel I need to develop further in these skills:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Reading	2
b	Language	3
c	Math	1

Interpersonal Skills

In responding to the statement: I feel competent in these areas:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Development	1
b	Guidance	3
c	Motivation	2
d	Counseling	4

In responding to the statement: I feel I need to develop further in these skills:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Develop	4
b	Guidance	2
c	Motivation	3
d	Counseling	1

Learning Theory

In responding to the statement: I feel competent in these areas:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Principles	1
b	Styles	2

In responding to the statement: I feel I need to develop further in these skills:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Principles	2
b	Styles	1

Classroom Management

In responding to the statement: I feel competent in these areas:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Discipline	1
b	Organization	2

In responding to the statement: I feel I need to develop further in these skills:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Discipline	2
b	Organization	1

Evaluation: Test and Measurements

In responding to the statement: I feel competent in these areas:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Selection	4
b	Administration	2
c	Interpretation	3
d	Use of Results	5
e	Grading	1

In responding to the statement: I feel I need to develop further in these skills:

Item	Area	Ranking
a	Selection	3
b	Administration	4
c	Interpretation	2
d	Use of Results	1
e	Grading	5

Summary and Recommendations

From the survey of needs made through the use of the Migrant Education Project Survey Form questionnaire; and, the data gathered at the Parental Involvement conference and other meetings, the training needs of personnel of educational programs for migrant children are recommended as follows:

1) The potential courses recommended for participants in an instructional program for Early Childhood (Migrant) Education teachers.
2) The potential courses recommended for participants in an instructional program for Secondary (Migrant) Education teachers.

Implications for Further Study

The purpose of this study was twofold: 1) to determine the special instructional training needed by Migrant Education Program personnel; and, 2) to address those needs within pertinent instructional programs.

A review of the literature concerning this topic , suggested that there are very few published studies focusing on the special training needed by Migrant Education personnel. Additional research into any of the following areas should be of great benefit to the personnel of local school districts, state educational agencies, and institutions of higher education that are responsible for the development of training programs for Migrant Education personnel.

1. An in-depth study of preservice (Higher Education) training programs designed specifically for training Migrant Education personnel.
2. An in-depth study of the role that teaching experience plays on the effectiveness of a training program for teachers of Migrant Children.
3. An in-depth study of in-service training programs designed specifically for Migrant Education personnel.
4. An in-depth study of the role that teaching assignments play on the effectiveness of an in-service program designed specifically for Migrant Education teachers.
5. Concerning the Migrant Education Programs of the present study, the recommendations for further study include:
   a. That the study be replicated to include as many Texas Migrant Education Program personnel as possible.
   b. That the study be replicated and compared with the training needed by Migrant Education Personnel in other states.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Carrillo, Lawrence W. Teaching Reading: A Handbook. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1976. pp. 1-2.

Fresno County Schools. Teaching Children Who Move With the Crops. Report and recommendations of the Fresno County Project. The Educational Program for Migrant Children. Walter G. Martin (Supt.) Fresno, California. September, 1955. p. 8.

King-Stoops, Joyce. Migrant Education: Teaching the Wandering Ones. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation. 1980. p. 19.

Lapp, Diane and Flood, J. Teaching Reading to Every Child. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. 1978. p. 765.

National Education Association. Choices Not Circumstances. Ray O. Fuentes (manager) Migrant Education Program. Washington D.C., 1981.

Potts, Alfred M. Developing an Understanding of Culture. In Arnold B. Cheyney (Ed.), The Ripe Harvest: Educating Migrant Children. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1972. p. 50.

Serrano, V.X. and Miller, W.A. Now-Records Follow the the Migrant Child. Compact. Summer. 1979.

Sutton, Elizabeth. Knowing and Teaching the Migrant Child. Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association and the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund. Washington D.C.: National Education Association. 1960. p. 35.

Sutton, Elizabeth. Working More Effectively with Migrants in our Schools. In Arnold B. Cheyney (Ed.), The Ripe Harvest: Educating Migrant Children. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1972. p. 50.

Texas Education Agency. Division of Migrant Education. Austin, Texas (Unpublished Program Guide).

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Grants to State Educational Agencies to Meet the Special Educational Needs of Migratory Children. Federal Register. Rules and Regulations. Vol. 45, No. 66, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 3, 1980. p. 22660.

Wey, Herbert W. and Cheyney, Arnold B. National Goals for Migrant Education. The Ripe Harvest: Educating Migrant Children. Arnold B. Cheyney, (Ed.), Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press. 1972. p. 215.